REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Independent claims 1, 3, 31, 68 and 82 have been amended above. Support for the independent claim amendments can be found, at least, in the specification at page 3, lines 1-18, page 4, lines 15-32, page 5, lines 3-7, lines 11-13, and lines 34-36, page 6, line 13, and page 9, lines 7-26, the figures, e.g., figures 2-4, and the claims as filed, e.g., claim 68.

Dependent claims 5-6, 8-17, 20-25, 33, 35, 37-42, 44-46, 48-56, 59-63, 70, 72, 74-81, 84, 86, 88, 90-93 and 95 have been amended to adjust antecedent bases to accommodate amendments made to the independent claims and to more clearly characterize sender users and recipient users.

No new matter has been added.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-95 are now pending in the application.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiners Bryan Wright and William Korzuch for a helpful in person interview on February 1, 2010. In the interview, the Examiners and Applicants' representatives discussed claim amendments relating to security setting being alterable by the recipient user. The Examiners suggested claim amendments related to the components of the system. The Examiners and the Applicants' representatives further discussed the cited reference, Hall, during the interview. No agreement was reached during the interview.

Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103

In paragraphs 2-66 of the Office Action, claims 31-95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hall (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,479). Issue is taken with that position. In paragraphs 67-96, claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of Katsikas (WO 01/16695 (cited from IDS)). Issue is taken with that position.

Hall does not provide a proper basis for either of the outstanding rejections. More particularly, Hall discloses a static security system/method whereby once a communication link between parties has been established; a fixed security aspect exists with respect to that link. As a consequence, in order to change the security aspect/level associated with the linked parties, a new link is required to be established. In contrast, the applicants disclose and claim a dynamic security/method/computer program, whereby once a communication link between parties has been established, including at least one sender user and a recipient user, the recipient user has the ability to change the security settings defining the security aspect/level for that established link, without the need to establish a new link. This cannot be accomplished by the system/method taught or suggested by Hall. Thus, the dynamic security feature of the applicants' invention and claims is materially different from Hall's disclosed or suggested static security system/method.

All of the independent claims of the subject application, claims 1, 3, 31, 68 and 82, have now been amended to reflect the dynamic security feature of the applicants' invention and the components of the applicants' invention as claimed (e.g., queue storage, receiver, processor, security module, gate, message transferor, generator). More particularly, the claims all now require a determination of a security status for an inbound message, made pursuant to security settings which are alterable by the recipient user, and using the sender identifier and the recipient identifier. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hall of a dynamic security system/method or the components as defined in each of the independent claims. Instead, Hall teaches a static security system/method, using an "unguessable" channel identifier as a part of an address for defining the link and "…for verifying that the message is authorized for delivery to the recipient…"; see Hall at col 3, lines 54-62. Thus, Hall's sender address and recipient address define the link and the

security level, since the security level, defined by the unguessable channel identifier, is a portion of the address. If Hall wishes to change the security level associated with a link between two parties on his system or using his method, he cannot change the security level without changing the address, since the link is defined by the address. Therefore, Hall <u>must</u> open another link, characterized by a <u>different</u> "unguessable" channel identifier, to change the security level linking the two parties. In contrast, the systems and methods defined by applicants' independent claims, permit an established link to be used while the recipient user can adjust the security aspects of the link dynamically, without requiring a new link to be established.

Katsikas discloses a system for eliminating unauthorized email sent to a user using an "authorized senders" list (ASL list); Katsikas, abstract. There is no teaching or suggestion in Katsikas of a dynamic security system/method or the components as defined in each of the independent claims. Instead, Katsikas describes eliminating unwanted email based on the sender address using the ASL; Katsikas, page 1, lines 7-8. Accordingly, Katsikas does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings by Hall.

It is submitted that all of the independent claims of the subject application, claims 1, 3, 31, 68 and 82, and claims 2, 4-30, 32-67, 69-81, and 83-95 dependent thereon, now fully and clearly define the dynamic security features of the applicants' invention, and that the claimed system/method/computer program for allowing or denying communication access, are patentably distinct over Hall alone, or in combination with Katsikas.

For these reasons, it is submitted that there now is no proper basis for either of the outstanding Section 102 or Section 103 rejections. Those rejections should be reconsidered and withdrawn. All claims 1-95, as now amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

****

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-4514. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-4514. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-4514.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 31, 2010   By /s Christopher E. Everett/

Pierce Atwood LLP   Christopher E. Everett
Customer Number: 35859   Registration No. 51,659
Telephone: 857-277-6900
Facsimile: 617-830-3227   Attorney for Applicant